

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested in the light of the amendments and following detailed discussion.

Applicants have amended the drawings by including replacement sheets containing a modified Figs. 2 and 4. Applicants have amended Figs. 2 and 4 by switching reference numerals 1 and 2 in both to correct this obvious error. Figs. 2 and 4 now are consistent with Fig. 1 and the specification, for example, page 6 lines 14-25. Annotated sheets are not believed to be necessary for explanation and have not been presented.

Applicants have amended the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 6 line 22, to correct two obvious typographical errors in the reference numerals set forth therein.

Claims 21, 23, 31, and 37-39 have been amended as to form without altering the scope of the claims. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments. Claims 21-39 are currently pending in the subject application.

Claim Objections

Claims 21-39 have been objected to because of informalities related to a perceived lack of antecedent basis, as follows:

Claim 21: citations of "the production; the plies; the interlayer; the inner faces; the area;" Claim 23: a citation of "the completion of the lamination process;" Claim 28: a citation of "the perimeter of an annulus;" Claim 31: citations

of “the interlayer; the area; the bore;” and Claim 35: a citation of “the lamination process.” In addition, it was noted that the claim preamble for claims 37-39 should read -The assembly--.

As noted above, claims 21, 23, 31, and 37-39 have been amended in an attempt to present the claims in a form acceptable to the Examiner. Claim 21 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis related to “the production,” “the plies,” “the interlayer,” and “the inner faces.” Proper antecedent basis exists for “the area,” as claim 21 states, “...thereby excluding the bonding interlayer from **an area**...” Claims 23, 31 and 35 have been amended to clarify the antecedent basis for the noted claim terms in each case. Claim 28 has not been amended as an annulus inherently has a perimeter, so that *explicit* antecedent basis for “the perimeter of an annulus” is not required.

All of the pending claims are in proper format and the claim objections should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 21-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claims 21-30, it is noted that the preamble of these claims are cited as “A method for the production of laminated panel,” but it is asserted that there are no method steps cited.

In response, claim 21 has been amended to explicitly recite “the method comprising laminating the inner face of the first glass ply to the inner face of the second glass ply with the bonding interlayer therebetween.”

As to claim 31, the limitation “wherein the interlayer is excluded from the area surrounding the bore and a load bearing insert is positioned in the area from which the interlayer has been excluded” is said to be confusing.

Amended claim 31 defines a laminated panel comprising a first glass ply laminated to a second glass ply with a bonding interlayer therebetween, the laminated panel having at least one bore passing through said panel, wherein the bonding interlayer is excluded from an area surrounding the bore and a load bearing insert is positioned in the area from which the interlayer has been excluded. It is clear from the description that the load bearing insert may be positioned prior to the lamination process or after the lamination process has been completed. In both embodiments, a load bearing insert is positioned in the void in the bonding interlayer, the void having been created by excluding the bonding interlayer from an area surrounding the bore. Amended claim 31 thus complies fully with 35 USC 112.

Regarding claim 35, the limitation “a load bearing annulus which has formed by the setting of a fluid which fluid has been introduced into the area from which the interlayer has been excluded after the lamination process has been completed” is asserted to be indefinite and confusing.

Claim 35 has been amended, wherein the insert comprises a load bearing annulus which has formed by the setting of a fluid, said fluid having been introduced into the area from which the interlayer has been excluded after the first glass ply has been laminated to the second glass ply. It is clear that claim 35 relates to embodiments wherein a load bearing insert is injected into the void in the interlayer (see, for example, [0006] of the Specification), the void having been created by excluding the interlayer from an area surrounding the bore.

The pending claims all comply fully with 35 USC 112 and these rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 21-37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Rowland et al. patent US5391411 ("Rowland").

It is asserted that Rowland discloses "a laminated panel comprising a first glass ply 11, a second glass ply 12 and a bonding interlayer 17 said laminate having at least one bore 14/15 extending through the panel wherein a sealing member 16 is placed between the plies so as to surround the bore and form a seal with the inner faces of the glass plies thereby excluding the interlayer from an area surrounding the bore and a load bearing insert 13 is positioned in the area surrounding the bore from interlayer has been excluded" (Referring to Figs. 1-5 and col. 3, lines 13-14, 57-58).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. According to the MPEP, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See MPEP 2131 (quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631). Put another way, for there to be anticipation, “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as it is contained in the ...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989).

Claim 21 defines a method in which, *inter alia*, “a load bearing insert is positioned in the area surrounding the bore from which the interlayer has been excluded.” In contrast, the attachment member 13 of Rowland is positioned within the bore 15 formed in the ply 12 and interlayer 17. See Fig. 4 and column 2, lines 60-62 (“Laminating two glass sheets 11 and 12 with a hole 15 in one glass sheet 12 only with an attachment insert 13 in the hole.”). Of course, Rowland’s attachment member 13 could not be positioned ***in the area surrounding the bore***.

For these reasons, Rowland fails to anticipate claim 21. In addition, claim 22-30 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 21, and thus are patentable at least on the basis of their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Claim 31 defines a laminated panel comprising a first glass ply laminated to a second glass ply with a bonding interlayer therebetween, the laminated panel having at least one bore passing through said panel, wherein the bonding

interlayer is excluded from an area surrounding the bore and a load bearing insert is positioned in the area from which the interlayer has been excluded.

As discussed above, the attachment member 13 of Rowland is not and could not be positioned in the area surrounding the bore. Thus, Rowland fails to anticipate claim 31. In addition, claims 32-39 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 31, and are patentable at least on the basis of their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is in condition for allowance. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is earnestly encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald A. Schurr", written over a horizontal line.

Donald A. Schurr

Registration No. 34,247

ATTORNEYS

Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate - 8th Floor
Toledo, Ohio 43604
Phone: (419) 249-7145